



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SYNTAX IN CAESAR

W. L. CARR

Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, Indiana

I. CASE CONSTRUCTIONS

The modern ideal in the study and teaching of ancient languages is scientific simplicity. It was a desire for simplicity that began over a generation ago to produce our now universally used first books, annotated texts, and selected vocabularies, supplanting the bare texts and unabridged lexicons with which our grandfathers began their study of the classics. Simplicity, concentration, definiteness, the elimination of non-essentials are the themes of numerous articles in the professional journals. Many books even are being issued, dealing with different phases of the subject, such as vocabulary or syntax, but all pointing in the same direction. The authors of the hundred and one *First Latin Books* now on the market agree in their desire to secure simplicity, even if they fail to agree in any other respect.

But all attempts at simplification, to be effective and not result in mere superficiality, must be based on scientific principles. Textbook makers and classroom teachers must see to it that their short-cuts square with the facts and must not be carried away with a laudable desire to "make the rough places plain." Genuine scholarship and the scientific point of view are needed, and needed in beginners' work as well as in university courses. In this scientific age a rational statement of the facts of a language in our textbooks and a scientific attitude on the part of our teachers will aid greatly in keeping the classics in favor alongside of the laboratory sciences. And a true scientific attitude will not only secure a greater respect for our work, but is the only means by which the much-to-be-desired simplification can be successfully effected. True scholarship and effective pedagogical method do not conflict. The results of historical and comparative study in philology have already greatly aided in

the simplification of language study. For example, the recognition of Sanskrit as a sister language of Greek and Latin in the great Indo-European family has practically solved the complicated problem of the Latin ablative, by showing its threefold nature. The classification of ablative construction as separative, sociative, and locative is implicit in all modern grammars and should be more widely employed in all elementary work.

The writer remembers that it was not until he was well along in his college course that he discovered any real system in the widely varying uses of the ablative. Such an illumination might just as well have come at the beginning of the work, if the subject had been properly presented. I shall try to show, a little later on, one of the methods which I have found helpful in impressing this fact on students in the first and second year's work. By treatment similar to that employed for the Latin ablative, the uses of the Greek and Latin moods have been made much clearer through a recognition of the fact that Greek, Latin, German, and English are at bottom very much alike in their modal machinery. An increased appreciation for the much-neglected English subjunctive is one very gratifying result. And I take it that the study of any foreign language by the great majority of English-speaking pupils must find its chief, or at any rate most evident and immediate justification in the beneficial results to be obtained with reference to the pupil's English. This is not to deny that many other advantages are to be gained. Certain it is that a knowledge of other civilizations, of the public and private life of other peoples, a first-hand appreciation of their literatures, are all eminently worth while in language study, but I do insist that such matters, in the earlier work at any rate, and for the great majority of our pupils, are merely incidental and are to be obtained in much more economical ways, and that a conscious study of language for language's sake should be the chief aim; and this is only another way of saying that the reflex influence on their own mother tongue is the test by which the value of foreign language study must be measured for the great majority of our students. Reason and experience have shown that the ancient languages, especially

Latin, are pre-eminently suited to this purpose, and the classics, whenever placed on trial for their lives, can always be successfully defended on the basis of their benefits to English in matters of etymology, grammar, and rhetoric. Of course back of adequate words, phrases and sentences there must always be logical, clean-cut thinking, and language has this advantage over the mathematical and physical sciences that its material is the end as well as the means of study. No nobler, no more fruitful field of study can be imagined than that of human thought as expressed in human speech, and the translation or analysis of a sentence, even the parsing of a noun, is nothing less than that.

In this discussion, therefore, I shall deal only with some of the purely linguistic problems, more particularly syntax, though I am not unmindful of the excellent results of historical, archeological, and antiquarian studies, by which work in the classics has been so greatly enriched. More particularly still, I shall consider the problem of case constructions in Caesar, the first real foreign language reading undertaken by the vast majority of our pupils. The taking-up of Caesar is the young scientist's first "field trip" and his first opportunity to test the knowledge he has gained in the first year's work. And it is just here that the most skilful guidance is needed to save him, on the one hand, from the notion that language is a purely mechanical and artificial sort of thing, to be worked out by the puzzle method, or, on the other hand, from the equally fatal idea that language is absolutely lawless and he had best consider the whole affair a guessing contest, first and last. The question is, "How much syntax shall be taught to pupils in Caesar?" My answer is, "Teach all there is there, *but no more.*" Whatever else will result from a detailed study of a given author, such as I am here suggesting, the pupil will be shown what constructions to learn, and the teacher will be shown what *not* to teach. At this point in his work the pupil knows, or should know, a case form when he sees it. He knows, or should know, that a nominative case is used either as a subject or predicate. Can he be helped to an equally sure knowledge of the only slightly more difficult uses of

Case Constructions in Caesar, B. G. III.

277	219	71	434	127	229	92
NOMINATIVES	GENITIVES	DATIVES	ACCUSATIVES	FROM-ABLATIVES	WITH-ABLATIVES	IN-ABLATIVES
in Caesar III express:	in Caesar III express:	in Caesar III express:	in Caesar III express:	in Caesar III express:	in Caesar III express:	in Caesar III express:
(1) Subject (a) of Finite Verb ¹ 269x (b) of Historical Infinitive ⁴ 271x (2) Predicate ¹ 6x	(1) The Whole ¹ (Partitive Gen.) 19x (2) Possession, etc. ¹ (Includ. Subj. Gen.) 153x (3) Composition or Material ² 22x	(1) Indirect Object ¹ 20x (2) Various Relations with Compound Verbs: <i>adiungo</i> ² 1x <i>occurro</i> ⁶ 1x <i>adisciscō</i> ⁹ 1x <i>proeficio</i> ¹¹ 2x <i>adequo</i> ¹² 1x <i>praesum</i> ¹⁴ 2x <i>insero, adfigo</i> ¹⁴ 1x <i>accido</i> ²² 1x	(1) Direction { <i>in</i> ¹ 53x <i>adi</i> ¹ 51x (Inc. Place Whither) 51x (2) Direct Object ¹ 225x (3) Subj. of Infinitive ¹ 57x (4) Space Relations with <i>per</i> ¹ 8x <i>propter</i> ² 15x <i>praeter</i> ³ 1x <i>intra</i> ⁶ 1x <i>proximus</i> ⁷ 1x <i>inters</i> ⁸ 1x <i>ad</i> (at, etc.) ⁹ 2x <i>apud</i> ⁹ 2x <i>contra</i> ⁹ 3x <i>post</i> ¹⁰ 1x <i>ob</i> ²³ 1x	(1) Separation { <i>ab</i> ¹ 15x Place Whence etc. ² 37x <i>ex</i> ² 37x <i>de</i> ¹ 9x (2) Agency, <i>ab</i> ¹ 19x (3) *Cause { <i>de</i> ² 19x <i>ex</i> ² 5x <i>propter</i> ⁹ 7x <i>sine</i> ²¹ 77x (4) Comparison ⁵ 1x (5) Material, <i>ex</i> ¹³ 2x (6) Point of View, <i>ab</i> ²² 3x (7) Accordance, — ²³ 1x	(1) Accompaniment { <i>cum</i> ¹ 13x <i>in</i> ¹ 11x <i>sub</i> ¹⁶ 1x (2) Route ¹ 6x (3) Attendant Circumstance { <i>cum</i> ¹ 4x <i>in</i> ¹ 4x (4) Ablative Absolute ¹ 129x (5) Means ¹ 44x (6) *Description ⁴ 4x (7) "Object" of <i>utor</i> ⁸ 2x <i>fruor</i> ²² 1x <i>potior</i> ²⁴ 1x (8) Degree of Difference ⁹ 10x (9) *Manner, — ¹⁵ 5x	(1) Place Where { <i>in</i> ¹ 50x <i>in</i> ² 8x <i>sub</i> ¹⁶ 3x (2) *Specification ⁴ 61x (3) Time When ⁶ or Within Which ¹² 19x <i>intra</i> ¹² 7x <i>intra</i> ¹² 19x
In chap. 1—18 constructions 2—3 3—3 first 4—2 appear 5—3 6—2 8—1 9—1 10—1 11—1 13—1 15—1 19—1 22—2 23—1	(4) Description (a) Quality ³ 8x (b) Measure ¹² 2x (5) "Object" ⁵ (Objective Gen.) 15x	(3) Various Relations with Certain Verbs: <i>persuadeo</i> ² 2x <i>placeo</i> ³ 1x <i>studeo</i> ¹⁰ 2x <i>noceo</i> ¹³ 2x <i>confido</i> ²⁵ 1x (4) Purpose ³ 8x (5) Reference ⁶ 5x (6) Agency with Fut. Pass. Part. ¹⁰ 18x (7) Various Relations with Adjectives: <i>proximus</i> ¹¹ 2x <i>adversus</i> ¹⁴ 1x <i>finitimus</i> ²⁰ 2x 5x	(5) Degrees ³ 7x (6) Duration of Time ⁵ 1x (7) Extent of Space ¹⁹ 2x (8) Predicate ²² 1x	(1) Separation { <i>ab</i> ¹ 15x Place Whence etc. ² 37x <i>ex</i> ² 37x <i>de</i> ¹ 9x (2) Agency, <i>ab</i> ¹ 19x (3) *Cause { <i>de</i> ² 19x <i>ex</i> ² 5x <i>propter</i> ⁹ 7x <i>sine</i> ²¹ 77x (4) Comparison ⁵ 1x (5) Material, <i>ex</i> ¹³ 2x (6) Point of View, <i>ab</i> ²² 3x (7) Accordance, — ²³ 1x	(1) Accompaniment { <i>cum</i> ¹ 13x <i>in</i> ¹ 11x <i>sub</i> ¹⁶ 1x (2) Route ¹ 6x (3) Attendant Circumstance { <i>cum</i> ¹ 4x <i>in</i> ¹ 4x (4) Ablative Absolute ¹ 129x (5) Means ¹ 44x (6) *Description ⁴ 4x (7) "Object" of <i>utor</i> ⁸ 2x <i>fruor</i> ²² 1x <i>potior</i> ²⁴ 1x (8) Degree of Difference ⁹ 10x (9) *Manner, — ¹⁵ 5x	(1) Place Where { <i>in</i> ¹ 50x <i>in</i> ² 8x <i>sub</i> ¹⁶ 3x (2) *Specification ⁴ 61x (3) Time When ⁶ or Within Which ¹² 19x <i>intra</i> ¹² 7x <i>intra</i> ¹² 19x

*Constructions of composite origin, repeated from above, where they are grouped for convenience:

Cause¹ (*from* or *with* or *in*), often indistinguishable from Means.
Specification⁴ (*in* or *from* or *with*).
Description⁴ (*with* or *from* or *in*).
Manner¹⁵ (*with* or *from* or *in*).

the other cases? The chief danger is that he will become confused and needlessly alarmed. I have had pupils and teachers, too, for that matter, estimate the number of different case constructions which they rather expected to find in a given book of Caesar as high as 150. It is just here that an out-and-out laboratory method, namely, an observation of the facts presented in the text being read, a classification of those facts, and deductions therefrom, is a plan which has been found most effective with pupils who have already gained the elements of a language. The exhibition and preservation of these classifications in chart form has served to make the work more definite and concrete. Such a treatment of case constructions as is herewith presented (see table) furnishes the pupil with all the grammar necessary for case constructions in the passage under consideration, and furthermore, what has been found sufficient for any such passage, with only minor changes, will be found sufficient for all of the pupil's work in the language. With the forest thus cleared of imaginary foes of unknown case constructions, the pupil can go calmly about his work, surrounded for the most part by such old friends as nominative subjects and accusative objects. It is the regular, easy case-uses that the pupil must be taught to know and believe in. But if the pupil has been forced to learn, as is too often the case, that he is likely to be asked for only the "freak," or, at best, the rarer, constructions, he is not entirely to blame when he tries to cover as much territory as possible by some such answer as "accusative of possession in the ablative absolute of time."

The accompanying table of case constructions is an attempt to reproduce in type a wall or blackboard chart such as I invariably have the pupils help me make up for at least one book of Caesar. There are several points of which I wish to speak. To begin with, this scheme with its seven columns is the graphic form in which I seek to have the pupils think of the case uses. I have chosen to present the facts for book iii, in this discussion, among other reasons, because none of the rarer constructions occur in this book, and because the order in which the constructions in each column happen to appear, is almost ideal. The

totals are not essential and are added here only as items of interest. The use of the formula, for example, "Genitives in Caesar iii express the Whole, Possession, etc.," seems to me less confusing to the pupil than to speak of a genitive as Partitive or Possessive. In fact, I try to get the pupil to take up every substantive in the first two or three chapters and then to tell as nearly as he can just what idea or relation the case form actually does express. When he has told that, he has *named the construction*. Opinions often differ, and the traditional categories are not always forthcoming. So much the worse for the categories! However influenced by the technical terms met with in the first year's work and by the notes and grammar references in the textbook, the pupils come to sufficient agreement to start the chart, which then grows under our hands as we proceed, new categories being added as they seem to be needed. The chart herewith presented is a finished product of classroom work, with the exception of the totals, which are my own addition. These totals are the result of somewhat arbitrary classification in many instances. In class work the pupils are shown that if a construction is only placed in the proper column that is often the best that can be done. It is easy thus to show how one construction merges into another, and how one construction grows out of another. Here, too, is illustrated the fact that the categories we employ are not always due to fundamental classifications in the one language but may have their practical value only because of a difference of idiom in the two languages. Examples of this sort are Ablatives expressing Agency, or Point of View, both clearly separative to the Roman consciousness, as is shown by the regular use of the separative prepositions, but our English idiom requires "by" for Agency and "at" or "on" for Point of View; hence the practical value of separate categories for these constructions. Another case in point is the Objective Genitive here given as a separate construction, because in English this idea is so frequently expressed by the use of the prepositions "for," "to," "toward" (direction words), "love for one's country," for example. On the other hand, the Subjective Genitive is regularly translated, as is the Genitive of Possession, by the prepo-

sitional phrase with "of," or the English possessive case, and thus requires no special mention. Again, Ablatives expressing Accompaniment, Means, Description, Manner, Attendant Circumstance, and even the Ablative Absolute may nearly always be translated by the use of the English preposition "with." I know no better way to impress the essential unity of the several constructions within such a group than by "ringing the changes" up and down the column, using English examples, such as the following (see the next to the last column of table) :

He came with a friend. (Accompaniment).

He came walking with a cane (Means).

He came with great speed. (Manner).

He is a man with great influence. (Description).

Further, such examples as: "He came with my consent," or "with his books strapped together," or even "*with* his books lost," (really *without* his books, and equal to "his books having been lost") show the easy transition from the slightly associative construction of Attendant Circumstance to the Ablative "Absolute" construction which, after all, really never *expresses* any idea but that of attendant circumstance. The other two constructions in this column, Route or Way by Which, and Degree of Difference are easily seen to be developed from Means and might well be given as (a) and (b) under that head. However, the effort in making up this scheme is to avoid too great complication, and a word of explanation in passing is all that is needed to justify the present grouping. Similarly, in the Accusative column, Degree (how much), Duration of Time (how long), and Extent of Space (how far), in reality the same thing, are here given as separate constructions, although usually no distinction in terms is made, or need be made, when language passes from the original and fundamental concrete relations involving space-ideas only, to those of time or pure abstraction. Language is primarily spatial, concrete, and the pupil should be made to realize this fact, though, as has been suggested, we use both in Latin and in English the same case-machinery and apply the same terminology in saying, for example, "They fought *from* the seventh hour *to* (till) evening" (Time), or "They fled *from*

danger to safety" (Abstract) as in expressing the more easily pictured idea, "They fled *from* the river *to* the forest (Space)." The setting-up of a new category for every "figurative" or "extended" use of a case would be as useless as it would be difficult. To take a single example: Cause, essentially an abstract idea, may be expressed in Latin, and very commonly is expressed by the use of the space-relation; Accusative with *propter* (along-of, by-cause-of, on-account-of), or with *ob* (up-against). Cause may also be expressed by the use of the *from*-Ablative, with or without a preposition, as in English we say, "He died *from* (or *of*) a wound." Source *from* which is of course the idea here. But we can also say in English, "He died *with* a wound" (Sociative) or "I rejoice *in* your success (Locative), and we know from the occasional use of *cum* and *in* that the Romans had equivalent methods of expressing Cause. Shall we therefore set up four categories? No, the thing to do, as it seems to me, is to allow the Accusative uses to take care of themselves, and in regard to the others say that the "Ablative is used to express Cause," which may in a given case be either *from* or *with* or *in*, so to be translated, or by any other of the causal prepositions or phrases. This method of disposing of a given Ablative I consider much better and really simpler than to evade the whole point by saying it is "just Ablative." In the chart Cause is placed first in the *from* column because of the rather frequent use of a *from*-preposition, and an asterisk calls attention to the grouping below where its composite origin is shown. Here, too, are placed, for similar reasons, Specification, Description, and Manner. That is, one may describe by saying "He is a man *of* good family" (Latin Genitive) or "*from* a good family, *with* great influence, *in* good circumstances" (Latin *from*-, *with*-, and *in*- Ablatives respectively).

Without going farther into details, let me call attention to some of the suggestive facts shown in the chart. There are 1,449 substantives in the 29 chapters of the book. There are 41 different constructions as here classified. This number could really be reduced as shown above. All these 41 constructions appear in the first 23 chapters, and 18 of them in the first chap-

ter alone. (See the first column of the table.) These 18 are, of course, the more common constructions and, as a matter of fact, are the ones to which 1,279 of the 1,449 substantives (or 88 per cent.) are to be referred. These oft-repeated constructions, the pupil can easily see, are eminently worth his acquaintance, and on the other hand the rarer constructions can be easily impressed as they appear because of their very rareness.

The reassuring thing about such a plan is that, with only slight changes in detail, it will work equally well for any book in Caesar or, for that matter, for any other Latin reading. Passages of equal length in Cicero have even fewer constructions. I have even used this same chart with Greek classes, the *from*-Ablatives, of course, becoming Genitives, and *with*- and *in*-Ablatives, Datives. In the remaining three books of Caesar only eleven other constructions are to be found; making a total of fifty-two for the four books usually read.¹

Other items shown in the chart will I hope prove suggestive. Further discussion is impossible within the limits of the present article. A plan similar to the one here presented has been employed in dealing with the uses of the subjunctive. It is the purpose of the writer to discuss this subject at a later time.

¹ These constructions are: (1) The Genitive with *potior*, used once in Book i (chap. 3); (2) The Genitive with *reminiscor* and *obliviscor*, used once each in Book i (13, 14); (3) The Genitive of Indefinite Value, used once in Book i (chap. 20) and once in Book iv (chap. 21), (this is, of course, only a variety of Description); (4) The Genitive with *interest*, used twice in Book ii (chap. 5); (5) The Dative of Possession, fairly common in the other books (e. g., i, 7); (6) The Accusative of Secondary Object, used occasionally in the other books (e. g., i, 12); (7) The Cognate Accusative, used once in Book iv (chap. 4); (8) The Ablative of Price (a variety of Means) used three times in Book i and once in Book iv (e. g., 18); (9) The Ablative with *opus est* (also a variety of Means), used once in Book i and once in Book ii (e. g., i, 42); (10) The true Locative (*domi*), used three times in Book i (e. g. ch. 18) and twice in Book iv (there is a possible sixth instance in Book i, chap. 31, the text being in dispute); (11) The Vocative, used once in Book iv (chap. 25).